

Appl. No. 10/626,913
Amdt. dated February 23, 2006
Reply to Office action of January 20, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

The courtesy extended by the Examiner during the telephone interview of February 22, 2006 is acknowledged with appreciation. During the telephone interview, the structural details within the claims were discussed as they relate to the previously cited references (Stewart and Rapata). The key structure that was discussed is directed to the fact that an annular area or space is bounded radially inwardly by the conical portion and radially outwardly by the anchor body. Of course, that annular area is bounded in the vertical direction by the vertical edges (upper and lower) of the conical surface of the conical portion. It is this area or space into which the hollow lower end of the post is received. Specifically, the annular space, which can be considered to be an annular ring that surrounds the conical surface of the conical portion and thus can receive the post. In distinction, for both the Stewart and Rapata patents, the structural items that have been previously identified as the body and the base plate are in direct contact with each other. As such, there is no annular area or space into which a hollow lower end of a post could be received.

As such, the claims as presented within the last amendment are distinguished over both the Stewart and Rapata patents.

Appl. No. 10/626,913
Amdt. dated February 24, 2006
Reply to Office action of January 20, 2006

During the telephone interview, the Examiner suggested/requested that some claim language changes be done to make the above discussed points clear. Specifically, as can be appreciated by the amendments to the independent claims, the language of annular area has been changed to annular space. Also, some functional language concerning the wedging of the lower end of the post against the conical portion within the annular space has been added.

It is reiterated that the claims are in condition for allowance and allowance at this time is respectfully requested. Of course, if the Examiner perceives any issue that might need further attention, the Examiner is explicitly invited to contact the applicants representative to discuss any such issue.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 35451.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Ronald M. Kachmarik, Reg. No. 34512

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

February 24, 2006